



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,170	11/27/2000	Marko Turpeinen	107962	8826

25944 7590 04/28/2004
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

EL HADY, NABIL M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/701,170

Applicant(s)

TURPEINEN ET AL.

Examiner

Nabil M El-Hady

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2154

1. Claims 1-12 are pending in this application.
2. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.
3. Claims 6, 9, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The use of the word "preferably" in claims 6, 9, and 12, renders the claims vague.
4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
5. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Linsk (US 6,138,142).
6. As to claim 10, Linsk discloses the invention as claimed including a server for producing services (the web server, col. 3, line 65) to a client via an Internet-type telecommunication network (the Internet, col. 3, line 62); characterized in that the server is arranged to receive from another server (Internet Service provider ISP, col. 3, line 61) the client's identification and/or

Art Unit: 2154

profile data (the profile information, col. 3, line 65) and to customize the services produced for the client according to the client's identification and/or profile data (col. 3, lines 60-67) and/or the identity of said other server (inherent in col. 3, lines 20-30).

7. As to claim 1, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10 above. In addition, Linsk discloses a method in which: a client contacts a first server (Internet Service provider ISP, col. 3, line 61) via an Internet-type telecommunication network (the Internet, col. 3, line 62); and provides the server with identification data of the client (inherent in order to authenticate the user and identify the user profile); the client is forwarded from the first server to a second server (the web server, col. 3, line 65), which provides services to the client; the first server transmits to the second server the client's profile data (the profile information, col. 3, line 65); and the second server customizes the services provided for the client according to the client's profile data (col. 3, lines 60-67) and/or the identity of the first server (inherent in col. 3, lines 20-30).

8. As to claim 7, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 10 above. In addition, Linsk discloses an arrangement, comprising: a second server (the web server, col. 3, line 65) arranged to provide services to a client; and a first server (Internet Service provider ISP, col. 3, line 61) arranged to receive from the client his identification data (inherent in order to authenticate the user and identify the user profile); via an Internet-type telecommunication network (the Internet, col. 3, line 62) and to forward the client to the second server; the first server is arranged to transmit the client's profile data (the profile information, col. 3, line 65) to the second server; and the second server is arranged to customize the services produced for the client according to the client's profile data (col. 3, lines 60-67) and/or the identity of the first server (inherent in col. 3, lines 20-30).

Art Unit: 2154

9. As to claims 3 and 9, Linsk discloses preventing the client from accessing some of the available services of the second server (col. 3, lines 32-40), and means, preferably a database connected functionally to the second server, for preventing the client from accessing some of the available services of the second server (inherent in col. 3, lines 32-40).

10. As to claim 4, Linsk discloses that said prevention is based on the identification data of the first server (inherent in col. 3, lines 27-30)

11. As to claim 5, Linsk discloses that in the service customization the services that are to be offered primarily to the client are selected from the available services of the second server on the basis of said profile data (col. 3, lines 8-40).

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 2, 6, 8, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linsk (US 6,138,142) in view of Teper et al. (US 5,815,665), hereafter "Teper".

14. Teper et al. is cited by the applicant in IDS paper filed February 9, 2001.

15. As to claim 2, Linsk does not explicitly disclose concealing from the second server the client's identification data before the client is directed to the second server. Teper, on the other

Art Unit: 2154

hand, discloses concealing from the second server the client's identification data before the client is directed to the second server (col. 2, lines 65-67). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Linsk and Teper because Teper's concealing from the second server the client's identification data would provide Linsk's with a high degree of protection against the misuse of user information (see, for example, Teper, col. 1, lines 46-49).

16. As to claim 6, Linsk does not disclose transmitting to the first server data about the services the client has selected in order to form profile conversion data. Teper, on the other hand, discloses transmitting to the first server data about the services the client has selected in order to form profile conversion data (col. 3, lines 36-41). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Linsk and Teper because Teper's transmitting to the first server data about the services the client has selected would provide Linsk's with a centralized location where user information is updated and may be reviewed (see, for example, Teper, col. 3, lines 41-44).

17. As to claim 8, Linsk does not necessarily disclose an encryption function for concealing the client identification data from the second server. Teper, on the other hand, discloses an encryption function for concealing the client identification data from the second server (col. 3, lines 5-30). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Linsk and Teper because Teper's use of an encryption function for concealing the client identification data from the second server would provide Linsk's with a high degree of security (see, for example, Teper, col. 3, lines 27-30).

Art Unit: 2154

18. As to claims 11 and 12, Linsk discloses preventing the client from accessing some of the available services of the second server (col. 3, lines 32-40), and means, preferably a database connected functionally to the second server, for preventing the client from accessing some of the available services of the second server (inherent in col. 3, lines 32-40).

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Oliver et al. (US 2002/0133412) ; Thomas (US 6,128,663) ; LeMole et al. (US 6,009,410); and Chaddha (US 6,345,293).

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nabil M El-Hady whose telephone number is (703) 308-7990. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2154

April 22, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "N. El-Hady". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a long, sweeping underline that extends downwards and to the right.

Nabil El-Hady, Ph.D, M.B.A.
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2154